

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments presented above and the following remarks is requested. Claims 1, 3, 39, and 40 are currently amended. Claims 2 and 30-38 have been cancelled.

A. Apparently Conflicting Claims

The Examiner stated that claims 1 and 30 of the present application conflict with claims 1 and 31 of Application No. 10/847,739 (“the ‘739 Application”) and required Applicants to either cancel the conflicting claims from all but one application or maintain a clear line of demarcation between the applications. Claim 1 is currently amended to include the limitations of claim 2 and thus Applicants believe that it is not in conflict with claim 1 of the ‘739 Application. Claim 30 of the present application has been cancelled.

B. Claim Rejections

1. Claims 1-2, 4-36, 37-38, 39-40

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-2 and 4-40 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson (3,730,359) in view of O’Neill (3,419,164) and Szendrodi (4,416,435). The Examiner stated the following:

- Referring to Figs. 7-9 of Anderson, the terms first class and general class do not add structure to the claims in 39-40.
- It would have been obvious to put passenger seats on the pallets of Anderson as taught by O’Neill because he shows that either cargo or passengers can be placed on moveable pallets.
- It would have been obvious to load/unload multi levels of mixed services of passengers and cargo simultaneously as taught by Szendrodi.
- Bar-coding on cargo/luggage is well known.

- It would have been obvious to provide the terminal of Anderson with well known vision and GPS docking for accurate docking.
- It would have been obvious to have aircraft refueling at the terminal which includes drains and vapor control.

2. Claims 3 and 36

The Examiner also rejected Claims 3 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of O'Neill and Szendrodi as set forth above and further in view of Husseiny (5,600,303). The Examiner stated that it would have been obvious to provide the terminal of Anderson with security as taught by Husseiny because it provides protection to customers.

3. Claims 39 and 40

The Examiner also rejected Claims 39 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Konya (6,863,243) in view of O'Neill (3,419,164) and Szendrodi (4,416,435). The Examiner stated it would have been obvious to put passenger seats on the pallets of Konya as taught by O'Neill because he shows that either cargo or passengers can be placed on moveable pallets. The Examiner further stated that it would have been obvious to further load and unload the multi-levels of mixed services of passengers and cargo simultaneously as taught by Szendrodi.

The rejections are respectfully traversed.

C. Argument

1. Claims 1-2, 4-36, 37-38, 39-40

The rejections of Claims 1-2 and 4-40 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson (3,730,359) in view of O'Neill (3,419,164) and Szendrodi (4,416,435) are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 is currently amended to include the limitations of claim 2, which recites that the ground support system claimed in claim 1 further comprises a remote baggage handling system that is remotely located from and transfers baggage to and from the airport interface terminal. Claim 39 is currently amended to recite the aircraft as having a passenger servicing bridge having at least a double door jetway. Support for the amendment is found in paragraph 124 of the specification. Claim 40 is currently amended to recite that the double door jetway of claim 39 includes at least two corridors. Support for the amendment is found in paragraph 124 of the specification. No new matter has been added to any of the currently amended claims.

There is no suggestion, disclosure, or teaching in any of the cited references that would motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to combine them in the manner proffered by the Examiner. Anderson is directed solely to the unloading and loading of freight on and off a freight aircraft, not a passenger aircraft. O'Neill is directed to the use of palletized package members on which passengers, baggage, and freight can be loaded in the terminal and then moved to the aircraft to be loaded. Szendrodi is directed to a baggage-handling system in which baggage is moved separately through the terminal from the passengers but generally in the same direction to and from the aircraft, the baggage route through the terminal being below the floor over which the passengers move. O'Neill and Szendrodi are thus both directed to passenger aircrafts, unlike Anderson. Accordingly, there is no motivation and there would not be any motivation to incorporate any passenger-related systems, devices, or components taught by either O'Neill and/or Szendrodi into the loading and unloading system of Anderson.

The Examiner further stated that it would have been obvious to put passenger seats on the pallets of Anderson. Anderson does not even disclose or mention the use of pallets. Accordingly, it would not have been obvious for such placement.

As previously stated above, Szendrodi is directed to a baggage-handling system. Thus there would be no motivation, suggestion, or teaching (and indeed there is none) to combine the teachings of Anderson, which is directed solely to freight aircrafts, with Szendrodi, which is directed to passenger aircrafts, to render obvious the invention of the present application.

In addition, neither O'Neill nor Szendrodi teaches or suggests a remote baggage handling system that is remotely located from the terminal, as claimed in claim 1. The baggage handling systems of Szendrodi and O'Neill are located in the terminal itself. In the present application, however, Applicants' baggage handling system is remotely located from the airport terminal in order to increase airport safety. See, e.g., paragraph 128 of the specification.

The Examiner also stated, without providing any support (i.e., specific or otherwise), that it would have been obvious to provide the terminal of Anderson with vision and GPS docking for accurate docking, and to use bar-coding on cargo/luggage. Applicants respectfully traverse that the Examiner is taking Official Notice of the stated items without concrete evidence for support as required by 37 CFR 1.104(c)(2). The limitations of an aircraft terminal mating system in the form of a machine vision technology system, of an aircraft terminal mating system that has a GPS, and the use of a bar code reader that reads cargo transported to and from an aircraft are not known in the art and are not taught or suggested by Anderson or any other reference cited by the Examiner. It is not appropriate to rely solely on common knowledge in the art without evidentiary support in the record as the

principal evidence upon which a rejection is based. In re Zurko, 258 F.3d 1379, 1386, 59 USPQ2d 1693, 1697 (Fed. Cir. 2001).

With respect to claim 3, there is no suggestion, disclosure, or teaching in any of the cited references that would motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to combine them in the manner proffered by the Examiner to scan baggage at a remote baggage handling station for weapons, explosives, or other unpermitted objects.

As to claim 25, there is no suggestion, disclosure, or teaching in any of the cited references that would motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to combine them in the manner proffered by the Examiner to provide a cargo carousel having a plurality of feed directions.

With respect to claim 28, there is no suggestion, disclosure, or teaching in any of the cited references that would motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to combine them in the manner proffered by the Examiner to provide a fuel supply and drain system as claimed.

As to claim 29, there is no suggestion, disclosure, or teaching in any of the cited references that would motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to combine them in the manner proffered by the Examiner to provide a brake cooling and drain system as claimed.

Finally, with respect to claims 39 and 40, again there is no suggestion, disclosure, or teaching in any of the cited references that would motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to combine them in the manner proffered by the Examiner to provide a passenger servicing bridge having at least a double door jetway or that such double door jetway includes at least two corridors.

Accordingly, claims 1, 4-29, and 39-40 are patentable over the cited references and should be allowed.

2. Claims 3 and 36

The rejection of Claims 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of O'Neill and Szendrodi as set forth above and further in view of Husseiny (5,600,303) is also respectfully traversed. The rejection as to claim 36 is moot because that claim has been cancelled.

As to claim 3, there is no suggestion, disclosure, or teaching in any of the cited references that would motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Anderson, O'Neill, Szendrodi, and Husseiny in the manner proffered by the Examiner. The first three references were previously discussed above. Although the fourth reference, Husseiny, is directed to a detector for detection of concealed explosives, drugs, and contraband using x-rays imaging and the like, the cited references, either alone or in any combination thereof, do not teach or suggest a remote baggage system scanning baggage from a remote location as claimed in claim 3. As previously discussed above, Applicants' baggage handling system is remotely located from the airport terminal in order to increase airport safety. See, e.g., paragraph 128 of the specification.

Accordingly, claim 3 is patentable over the cited references and should be allowed.

3. Claims 39 and 40

The rejections of Claims 39 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Konya (6,863,243) in view of O'Neill (3,419,164) and Szendrodi (4,416,435) are respectfully traversed.

Konya is directed solely to an aircraft servicing system. O'Neill and Szendrodi were previously discussed above. There is no suggestion, disclosure, or teaching in any of the cited references that would motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to combine

them in the manner proffered by the Examiner to arrive at the inventions claimed in claims 39 and 40. In particular, none of the cited references teach or even suggest providing a passenger servicing bridge having at least a double door jetway or that such double door jetway includes at least two corridors.

Accordingly, claims 39-40 are patentable over the cited references and should be allowed.

D. Conclusion

In view of the amendments and the remarks above, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, issuance of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Please charge any fees required or credit any overpayment in the filing of this amendment to deposit account 50-3195.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: New York, New York
June 27, 2006

OSTRAGER CHONG FLAHERTY
& BROITMAN P.C.
Customer No. 44702

By: /Andres N. Madrid/
Andres N. Madrid
Registration No. 40,710

250 Park Avenue, Suite 825
New York, New York 10177-0899
Telephone: (212) 681-0600
Fax: (212) 681-0300